| From the INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXA                             | MINING AUTHORIT  | Υ                                | PCT   |  |
|--|--|----------------------------------|---|--|
| MALEWSKA, Ewa P.O. Box 613, 00-950 Warszawa 1 POLOGNE              | A CAMPACATA  |                                  | WRITTEN OPINION  (PCT Rule 66) おりしまじょうな                                   |  |
|  |  | Date of mailing (day month year) | 11/02/2004  |  |
| Applicant's or agent's file reference A/N-1010/901/961             |  | REPLY DUE                        | within 2 / 00 months/days from the above date of mailing                  |  |
| International application No.                                      | International filing date  | (day month year)                 | Priority date (day month year)  |  |
| PCT/PL03/00040   | 17/04/2003   |                                  | 26/06/2002  |  |
| AMMONO SP. Z.O.O.  |  |                                  |   |  |
| This written opinion is the first drawn                            | up by this International   | Preliminary Examining            | 3 Authority.  |  |
| 2. This opinion contains indications relati                        | ng to the following items  | :                                |   |  |
| I X Basis of the opinion   |  |                                  |   |  |
| II Priority  |  | ·                                |   |  |
| III Non-establishment of opin                                      | nion with regard to novel  | ty, inventive step and i         | industrial applicability  |  |
|  |  |                                  |   |  |
| IV Lack of unity of invention                                      | 1  |                                  |   |  |
| V X Reasoned statement under citations and explanations            | Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with reg supporting such stateme                              | ard to novelty, inventi<br>nt    | ve step or industrial applicability;                                      |  |
| VI Certain documents cited   | . ·  |                                  |   |  |
| VII Certain defects in the inter                                   | rnational application  |                                  |   |  |
| VIII Certain observations on the                                   | ne international application   | on                               |   |  |
| 3. The applicant is hereby invited to reply                        | to this opinion.   |                                  |   |  |
| to grant an extension, see R                                       | ule 66.2(d).<br>y. accompanied, where a  | ppropriate, by amendn            | of that time limit, request this Authority nents, according to Rule 66.3. |  |
| Also For an additional opportunit<br>For the examiner's obligation | y to submit amendments<br>n to consider amendment<br>tion with the examiner, s | is and/or arguments, s           | ee Rule 66.4 <i>bis</i> .   |  |

4. The final date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is:

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/

European Patent Office, P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2 NL-2280 HV Rijswijk - Netherlands Tel.: (+31-70) 340-2040 Fax: (+31-70) 340-3016

Authorized officer

Examiner

If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.

Formalities officer (incl. extension of time limits) Tel. (+49-89) 2399 2828



- I. Basis of the opinion
- 1. The basis of this written opinion is the application as originally filed.
- V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability
- 1. In light of the documents cited in the international search report, it is considered that the invention as defined in at least some of the claims does not appear to meet the criteria mentioned in Article 33(1) PCT, i.e. does not appear to be novel and/or to involve an inventive step (see international search report, in particular the documents cited X and/or Y and corresponding claims references).
- 2. If amendments are filed, the applicant should comply with the requirements of Rule 66.8 PCT and indicate the basis of the amendments in the documents of the application as originally filed (Article 34 (2) (b) PCT) otherwise these amendments may not be taken into consideration for the establishment of the international preliminary examination report. The attention of the applicant is drawn to the fact that if the application contains an unnecessary plurality of independent claims, no examination of any of the claims will be carried out.
- NB: Should the applicant decide to request detailed substantive examination, then an international preliminary examination report will normally be established directly. Exceptionally the examiner may draw up a second written opinion, should this be explicitly requested.